REMARKS

Response to Claim Objections

Claim 2 has been amended so the claim objections are rendered moot.

Response to Rejection under 35 USC 103

Claims 1 – 6, 10 – 15, and 18 - 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cline in view of Carlson. Cline discloses an automotive radiator that includes high pressure and low pressure sensing switches incorporated into the radiator itself. A buzzer or indicator light indicates excessive pressure or low pressure. Cline does not disclose a manifold that connects with the automotive cooling system. The system of Cline only monitors the status of the radiator itself, not the entire cooling system. Carlson discloses a gas piping system that monitors nitrous oxide and oxygen pressure in medical gas piping systems. The medical gas piping systems uses a manifold for connecting to multiple oxygen and nitrous oxide tanks with high and low pressure gauges. Once a tank is empty, the manifold switches to the next tank.

Claims 1 – 20 all include the limitation of a monitor system for monitoring the pressure in a pressurized automotive cooling system. The system as claimed includes a manifold that connects with the pressurized automotive cooling system so the entire system is monitored.

It is a tenet of patent law that under 35 U.S.C. 103, the references must suggest the need for a limitation in order to modify a reference to achieve that limitation. As stated by the Federal Circuit in *In re Fritch*, 23 USPQ 2d 1780, 1783-1784 (Fed. Cir. 1992), "The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification."

In the present instance, there simply is no suggestion of any kind for modifying the system of Cline by eliminating the sensors incorporated directly into the radiator, adding a manifold that connects with the pressurized cooling system, and connecting high and low pressure sensors in the manifold. Cline is concerned only with monitoring the pressure of the radiator, not the entire automotive cooling system. For example, if the thermostat of the automotive cooling system is malfunctioning, the radiator may be closed from the engine block

cooling system. Thus, the radiator may be within the normal operating pressure range while the pressure within the engine block may be outside the normal operating pressure range. Cline is not concerned with this problem. Carlson in no way is concerned with this problem. Carlson utilizes a manifold for switching medical gas tanks, not for monitoring the status of an automotive cooling system. There simply is no disclosure or teaching in either Carlson or Cline of using a manifold connected to an automotive cooling system to monitor the status of the entire automotive cooling system. Thus claims 1 – 20 are allowable over the prior art.

Additionally, in regard to claims 2, 5, 6, 7, 11, 14, 15 and 16, there is no teaching in either reference of using a pressure gauge to monitor the actual pressure of an automotive cooling system. There would be no teaching to modify the device as set forth in claim 2 to add a pressure gauge to monitor the status of the automotive cooling system. Merely because something may be modified does not render it obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). There must be motivation for doing so. Thus these claims are allowable over the cited prior art for these additional reasons as well.

The Applicant respectfully requests that claims 1 - 20 be allowed in view of the above remarks. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if further discussions would advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/6/2006

By: /glennlwebb/s
Glenn L. Webb, Reg. No. 32,668
PO 951
Conifer, CO 80433
303 816 4893